

REMARKS

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-16 are currently pending.

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-16 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101 AS BEING DIRECTED TO NON-STATUTORY SUBJECT MATTER

The Applicant's representative contacted the Examiner via telephone regarding this rejection on June 14, 2007. In the telephone conversation, the Examiner agreed that the 35 U.S.C. § 101 rejection with respect to claims 1-9 is improper and further agreed to withdraw the rejection with respect to these claims. The Applicant kindly thanks the Examiner for his assistance.

Claims 10-14 and 16 produce a useful, concrete and tangible result. Amended claim 10 recites converting the converted one direction or combination of the plurality of directions into a predetermined signal. A signal is a useful, concrete and tangible result as said signal can be transmitted, received and interpreted. Amended claim 11 also recites a predetermined signal. Claims 11-14 and 16 depend from claim 10 and inherit the features thereof.

Claim 15 is amended herein to recite a computer-readable medium to more fully comply with 35 U.S.C. § 101. In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

III. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1 AND 10-15 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER KASHIWAGI ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,037,939) IN VIEW OF WISTENDAHL ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,496,981)

Claim 1 as amended herein recites a coordinate converting section for converting a positional relationship between the coordinates designated by the coordinate input section and a predetermined position on the screen of the display section into one direction or a combination of a plurality of predetermined directions. Claims 10 and 11 recite somewhat similar features. The Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art fails to teach this feature.

Kashiwagi discusses a multi-window display device that enables a user to interactively manipulate data retained in a computer system. See column 1, lines 9-13, of Kashiwagi. The position and size of a window region to be displayed are determined by the designation of a beginning point (x1, y1) and an ending point (x2, y2). See column 24, lines 39-61, of Kashiwagi. The window display content calculation section receives information such as the display data

from the window display content storage section and information such as sizes and positions of windows, coordinates of the display data and magnification ratios from the window storage section. See column 24, lines 4-9, of Kashiwagi. The window display content calculation section performs a coordinate transform for the coordinates of the display data using a magnification ratio of the data. See column 24, lines 9-12, of Kashiwagi.

The Office Action states on page 3 that Kashiwagi discloses the above feature of claim 1, without providing reasoning. Per the above, Kashiwagi performs a coordinate transform based on a **magnification ratio**. Kashiwagi does not teach converting a positional relationship between the coordinates designated by the coordinate input section and a predetermined position on the screen of the display section **into one direction or a combination of a plurality of predetermined directions**, as recited in claim 1. Rather, Kashiwagi discusses generating windows using the beginning and ending points designated by a mouse. See column 24, lines 39-61, of Kashiwagi. Further, nothing is cited or found in Wistendahl that teaches or suggests the above feature. Thus, for at least the reasons above, Kashiwagi and Wistendahl, both individually and in combination, fail to render claim 1 unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The above comments are specifically directed to claim 1. However, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be useful in understanding various differences of other rejected claims over the cited art.

Claim 15 as amended herein also recites a combination of a plurality of predetermined directions. As argued above with respect to claim 1, Kashiwagi does not teach this feature. Thus, for at least the reasons above, claim 15 also patentably distinguishes over the cited art.

The above comments are specifically directed to claim 15. However, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be useful in understanding various differences of various other rejected claims over the cited art.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

IV. ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claims 2-9 recite patentable subject matter.

V. CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Serial No. 10/669,702

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 10-15-2007

By: Michael A. Leonard II
Michael A. Leonard II
Registration No. 60,180

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501